

**Remarks**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected.

Claims 1-10 are presently amended.

Claims 11 and 12 have been added.

Claims 1-12 are submitted herein for review.

In the Office Action dated October 23, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctively claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner specifically refers to the use of the term “appropriate” in various contexts, as well as some antecedent basis concerns. Applicant has amended the claims to remove the term “appropriate”, and to address antecedent basis concerns.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103 as being unpatentable over Lee (KR 2001028721 A), and further in view of Silderberg (US 20030010821 A1).

The present application discloses a method and a system, each having more than one embodiment.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of paying for a parking space. The method includes the step of providing a user with a code specific to a first payment corresponding to a first authorized parking time. The method also includes the step of the

user making a second payment corresponding to a second authorized parking time, and when making the second payment, the user providing the code of the first payment so as to increase the second authorized parking time by a residual authorized time corresponding to the first authorized parking time.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a parking space payment system including a payment means wherein a user can make a first payment to benefit from a corresponding first authorized parking time, and a second payment to benefit from a corresponding second authorized parking time. The system also includes a processing and communication means that supplies said user a code specific to said first payment. The system also includes a processing and input means whereby said user can, during the second payment, enter the code of the first payment and thereby increase the second authorized parking time by a remaining authorized parking time corresponding to the first authorized parking time linked to the first payment.

For both the method and the system, a user is providing a code from the first payment to increase the second authorized parking time by a residual authorized parking time. Such a feature is not present in the Lee or in the Silderberg references cited by the Examiner.

Lee describes a parking machine with a controller that calculates balance for residual parking time when the parking time falls short of full parking time and refunds the balance. In other words, Lee describes, when the user leaves the parking space before the expiry time of the authorized parking time, to refund to the use the residual parking time. As such, Lee does not teach or suggest the teaching set forth in the present pending claims. For example, Lee does not include an arrangement where the system provides a

code in connection with a first payment where the code can be used by the user to increase the second authorized parking time by the residual time remaining from the first authorized parking time..

Silderberg describes when the paid parking time has almost expired, to telephone the user's mobile telephone so as to provide an indication that parking time has almost expired. Silderberg further describes that the user will be asked whether the user wishes to extend parking time, in which case the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended. Silderberg further describes that the parking meter has a unique identifying telephone number which can be dialed by the station so that information can be transmitted from the station to the appropriate telephone received associated with the parking meter. As such, Silderberg does not teach or suggest a user using a code provided from a first payment to increase the second authorized parking time by the residual time remaining from the first authorized parking time.

Even if the references are combined, the resulting system would still not teach or suggest all of the elements of either of the independent claims. For example, neither Lee nor Silderberg discloses an aspect by which, when a user is making the second payment, the user can enter a code from the first payment to increase the second authorized parking time by a residual authorized parking time corresponding to the first authorized parking time linked to the first payment. Since **neither reference contains this aspect of the present invention, which is expressed as an element in both claim 1 (independent method claim) and claim 10 (independent system claim)**, the prior art references cited by the Examiner in the Office Action cannot be combined in any way to disclose or

render obvious the present invention.


For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 be withdrawn. Also, as claimed 2-9 depend from claim 1, these rejections should be withdrawn for at least the same reason. Since new claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and claim 10 respectively, these new claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance, the earliest possible notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that an interview would facilitate the prosecution of this Application he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SOFER & HAROUN, L.L.P.

By



\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Sofer  
Reg. No 34,438  
317 Madison Avenue  
Suite 910  
New York, NY 10017  
(212) 697-2800  
Customer # 39600

Dated: February 23, 2009